

JPRS: 3091

21 March 1960

CRITICISM OF SOME OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL VIEWS
OF THE BOURGEOIS RIGHT-WING ELEMENTS AND REVISIONISTS
IN CHINA (1957-1958)

[Translation]

MAILED 15 MAR 1960 FILE

19980109 115

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

----- U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE -----
205 EAST 42ND STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FOREWORD

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

JPRS: 3091
CSO: 3302-D

CRITICISM OF SOME OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL VIEWS
OF THE BOURGEOIS RIGHT-WING ELEMENTS AND REVISIONISTS
IN CHINA (1957-1958)

Problemy Vostokovedeniya
/Problems of Oriental Studies/
No 5, 1959, Moscow
Pages 83-92
Russian, bi-monthly

Kuo Shao-T'ang

From the first days of its existence, the Communist Party of China has fought the battle on the ideological front against imperialists, feudalists and bourgeois reformists. The then still youthful Marxists Li Ta-chao, Mao Tse-tung, Tsai Ho-hsin, Chu Chiu-po, Yun Tai-yin, and others aimed stunning blows against the subjective-idealist philosophy of American pragmatism, which in China was represented by Hu-Shih and his followers; they conducted an unrelenting battle with every variation of idealist philosophy which had been introduced into China from the West: positivism, Intuitivism, Nietzscheanism, Kantism, Machism. The Chinese representatives of these philosophical movements hostile to Marxism were Liang Chi-Chao, Chang Chiung-mai, Chang Tung-sun, Ting Weng-kiang, and others. The Marxists also opposed the Buddhist and Confucian philosophical systems, which were propagated by Liang Shu-ming, T'ai Hsiu, and others. The Chinese communists exposed the reactionary philosophy of "vitalism," "biologism" and of other systems which had been set forth in the writings of T'ai Chi-t'ao, Chen Li-fu, T'ao Hsi-sheng and other Kuomintang "theoreticians." The Marxists showed convincingly that all these rank reactionaries had broken with the philosophical basis of Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary teachings.

By struggling consistently with right-wing opportunism and liquidationism, with revisionism and dogmatism, with sectarianism, empiricism and other varieties of opportunism, the Chinese communists, headed by Mao Tse-tung, learned how to reveal the theoretical roots, the vicious methodology and anti-scientific views of the apostates from Marxism in a profound manner.

In the wake of these battles the ideological-political level of members of the party was raised and its theoretical cadres were strengthened.

The victory of the people's revolution and the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the people gave the working class and toiling masses broad access to theoretical knowledge, to the mastery

of Marxism-Leninism. By doing much work in the sphere of the ideological education of toilers and the education and re-education of the intelligentsia, the Communist Party broadened the implacable struggle with the influences of the remnants of feudal and bourgeois ideologies. At the end of 1954 and in 1955, the Chinese communists together with the progressive intelligentsia annihilated the pro-imperialist philosophy of pragmatism as taught by Hu-Shih, exposed the counterrevolutionary essence of the pragmatic views of Hu Feng and his group in the sphere of esthetics, as well as the retrograde idealist philosophy and the landowner-bourgeois sociology of Liang Shu-ming and his disciples. All these victories on the ideological front were undoubtedly of importance for the development of the socialist revolution in the field of economy in 1956-57.

In 1957-58, a national movement for the regulation of style and for a struggle with bourgeois ideology which had appeared with the development of the socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts was founded in China. In essence, this was a struggle between two roads of development in China: the socialist and the capitalist road. The victory in this struggle was represented by the solution of the central question -- "Who-whom?" -- in the field of politics and ideology. An analysis of this struggle has therefore undoubtedly real scientific and political significance.

In this article we will limit ourselves to an examination of the views of bourgeois right-wing elements and revisionists on some basic problems of philosophy and sociology, and to an account of the criticism of these views by the Chinese communists.

As is known, the right-wing bourgeois elements in China used as their platform the problems of science and culture, attempting "to liberate" science from politics, which means in essence from the leadership of the Communist Party. They strove for a revival of bourgeois sociology and historiography, idealist philosophy and bourgeois economic teachings. Attempting to utilize the movement for the regulation of style to their advantage, they went over to the offensive on the ideological front, having published in the Kuangming Jihpao of 9 June 1957, a programmatic document, "Some Observations on the Problem about the Science System in Our Country," which had been drafted by professors Tseng Chao-lung, T'ung Li-chou, Chien Wei-chang and others under the supervision of Chang Po-chun.

The scientists with a reactionary leaning attempted to found in counterbalance to the government organs which were guiding scientific work different "independent" organizations and societies which are free from "interference" by the Communist Party of China. In June of 1957 a "Committee of Sociologies" was formed on the initiative of Fei Hsiao-t'ung, Chen Ta, Wu Tsing-han and other professors.

Prof. Chen Cheng-han and others suggested the setting up of a "Committee of Economic Planning" by bourgeois economists, which would be able to control the government's actions. Hsu Mu-yun and others wanted to organize a revisionist "corporation of philosophers."

The opponents of Marxism in China often tried to appear under the flag of "improvement" or "correction" of Marxist teachings. Thus, Prof. Hsu Mu-yun -- scientific collaborator of the Institute of Philosophy in the Chinese Academy of Sciences and former assistant rector of Wuhan University, now expelled from the ranks of the Communist Party -- wrote more than 20 articles during the spring and summer of 1957 in which he came out against Marxism-Leninism under the slogan "subject everything which still does not correspond to contemporary conditions to revision" (Chehsueh Yenchiu, 1957, No 6, p. 33).

Hsu Mu-yun published an article in the pages of the Shanghai paper, Wenhung Pao, in which he "defined" the Marxist position on the nature of man. In the sixth thesis about Feuerbach, Karl Marx wrote: "The nature of man is not an abstract one, which is inherent in different individuals. In its reality it is a totality of all social attitudes" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Coll. Wks., 2nd ed., Vol 3, p. 3). Developing this position, Mao Tse-tung said in 1942: "Is there such a thing as human nature in life? Of course there is. But only concrete human nature and not abstract human nature exists in the world. In a society of classes there exists only human nature which is imbued with a definite class character, and not a non-class human nature" (Mao Tse-tung, Sel. Wks., Vol 4, pp. 158-159). In opposition to this, Hsu Mu-yun attempted to show the abstract, non-class existence of some general human nature, referring despite this in ... an attempt at transforming social relations in China. "If the universality of human nature does not exist (he wrote), then how will the Chinese bourgeoisie transform itself and become socialist?" (Wenhung Pao, 7-8 June 1957). Is it not evident that social transformations in China from the position of a "universal human nature" are being presented in a perverted manner as the result of the "community" of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, in the absence of a class struggle in the country.

Hsu Mu-yun also "corrects" F. Engels. In 1892, in the foreword to "The Condition of the Working Class in England," F. Engels mentioned the immaturity of some formulations in this work of his younger years. He wrote: "Thus, for instance, heavy stress is put in the book (particularly at the end) on the fact that communism is not simply the party doctrine of the working class, but a theory whose final aim is the liberation of the whole society, including capitalists, from the narrow boundaries of contemporary relations. This assertion is true in the abstract sense, but is useless in practice, and to a large extent even worse than that. If the propertied classes themselves do

not feel any need for liberation and even oppose the self-liberation of the working class with all their might, then the working class must prepare and carry out the social revolution alone" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Sel. Wks., Vol II, 1955, p. 391). Hsu Mu-yun, once again referring to China's experience, declared this explanation of F. Engels to be untrue, since "Time, place and conditions have changed. That which Engels regarded to be true in the abstract sense has acquired practical meaning in contemporary China ... the Chinese bourgeoisie not only did not offer opposition to the liberation of the working class, but itself felt the need for liberation from capitalist production relations. It itself accepted the socialist transformation and struggles for its transformation into a working class" (Chehsueh Yen-chin, 1957, No 6, p. 34).

Opposing the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle, Hsu Mu-yun stated in the article, "To Whom Does the Truth Belong?" that it is erroneous to think that the truth belongs only to the proletariat. He wrote: "At the present there are no longer antagonistic contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat ... the bourgeois elements have gradually been proletarianized in the process of the socialist transformation ... the proletarians do not always have approach to practical problems" (Wengyi Yuepao, 1 May 1957). Attempting to refute the Marxist position on the class character of ideology, Hsu Mu-yun asserted in effect that "the truth belongs to all." In his other articles Hsu Mu-yun insisted that the difference between the Chinese bourgeoisie and the country's working class exists only in a direct relationship to their activities, and that the theory of a class struggle in China is an expression of "sectarianism."

Hsu Mu-yun also attempted to confuse the basic question of philosophy concerning the relation of thought to being. He contended that idealism and materialism have general outlines in "dialectic thought which both the idealists and the materialists have" (Chehsueh Yen-chin, 1957, No 6, p. 38), slurring over that which is most basic in the contrast between the materialist and idealist dialectic.

Such were the attempts by Hsu Mu-yun and his colleagues from the "corporation of philosophers" to reconcile the ideology of the bourgeoisie with the ideology of the proletariat, and materialism with idealism.

Just as little originality is there in Hsu Mu-yun's "theory of truth," which the author states in the following manner: "In order to find out whether reality and practice conform to one or another thought and thing in the ideas of man it is necessary to ask for the opinions of others. If people's opinions coincide with mine, then my opinion is real, objective and universally-recognized truth" (Chehsueh

Yenchin, 1957, No 6, p. 41). This reasoning is nothing new. It is essentially a rehash of Bogdanov's theory of "social-organizational experience." If one is to consider "the opinion of many" as truth, then one can accept God and death as an objective reality, since many people still believe in their existence. In criticizing the Machist Bogdanov, V. I. Lenin wrote: "To think that philosophical idealism will disappear by substituting the consciousness of mankind for the consciousness of the individual, or social-organizational experience for personal experience, is the same as to think that capitalism's disappearance can be effected by the substitution of a stock company for a single capitalist" (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol 14, pp. 217-218).

One of Hsu Mu-yun's articles was devoted to external and internal categories of philosophy. The author's reasoning about these philosophical categories has a definite political orientation. For instance, Hsu Mu-yun views the criticism of one communist by another, and particularly criticism from above, as an illegal "attack from without." He makes an effort to prove that the class struggle is the result of the fact that the advanced class is provoked by the resistance of reactionary forces inside the country. Thus it is though as if the bourgeoisie has now become the defender of socialism in China, and the communists are artificially kindling the class war in the country. Hsu Mu-yun asserts further that to solve antagonistic oppositions and to carry out the struggle with counterrevolutionary elements is impossible before all contradictions among the people have been overcome. It is this thesis of his which is being used in defense of the counterrevolution. As long as it is certain that internal contradictions are inherent in the development of a society, that they arise regularly and continuously, that they are overcome and appear anew, it will consequently -- according to Hsu Mu-yun -- never be possible to overcome antagonistic contradictions. From this it follows that it is impossible to suppress the counterrevolution until all the mistakes and shortcomings, which it uses in its interest, are overcome.

* * *

Despite the fact that the reactionary essence of the anti-scientific philosophy of pragmatism has been thoroughly exposed and the influence of this reactionary trend has been fundamentally undermined in China, some right-wing philosophers have attempted to rehabilitate pragmatism and specifically its newest variety -- Dewey's instrumentalism. Thus Chen Yu-sung, assistant dean of the pedagogical faculty of the Peking Pedagogical Institute, came out with an article as far back as the spring of 1957, in which he tried to maintain that Dewey's philosophy can be turned against faith in the supernatural, that it does not deny the existence of an objective reality, and that it is not the philosophy of imperialism. In Chen Yu-sung's words, the

main spearhead of the struggle must be directed not against pragmatism, but against monism, including materialism, which the people of China are doing incorrectly, "'killing with one stroke' pragmatism" (Wenhung Pao, 3 April 1957).

Prof. Chen Yu-sung's attempt at contrasting pragmatism to religion is, however, absurd, for idealism is inseparable from religion. V. I. Lenin writes: "Pragmatism ridicules metaphysics and materialism and idealism, extols experience and experience alone, recognizes practice as the only criterion ... and ... most satisfactorily removes God from all this for practical purposes, only for practice; without any metaphysics, without any way out for the reapportioning of experience" (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol 14, p. 327).

Another ardent defender of pragmatism was one of the active men of the rightwing-bourgeois bloc, Wu Tsing-chao, professor at the People's University. A disciple of Hu-shih, he came out against "abstract philosophical reasoning," which means against problems of principles and for a "concrete, simple study" and solution of problems "drop after drop," which in essence means denying things and phenomena.

Wu Tsing-chao regards sociology as a simple interrelation of problems: the population problem, family life, political and juridical problems, etc. -- but not as a study of the development of society. He openly calls his method "the theory of totality." Coming out against monistic views, first and foremost against dialectical and historical materialism, he thinks that "geographic, biological, psychological, cultural and other factors have an equal influence on social life." Like a pragmatist, he thinks that truth is only conditional, temporary and relative, that each individual defines it according to his own judgment, and that therefore "social problems cannot generally be solved with the aid of some sort of legislation" (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957). As the Chinese press noted, such deductions cast doubt on the entire creative work of the people which is aimed at the solution of social contradictions.

Opposing Marxist methodology, Wu Tsing-chao needed to lean only on facts, to proceed only from concrete reality, since facts and reality are for pragmatists a subjective category of ideas. Therefore his appeal as a matter of fact signifies an attempt to do only superficial research on phenomena, to do it onesided, unobjective and incorrect. Announcing that "hypotheses must not proceed from dogmatism," Wu Tsing-chao rejects the laws of social development revealed by Marxism-Leninism. As far as concerns practice, Wu Tsing-chao, just like the other pragmatists, interprets it as being something subjective and personal. For him there exist both "personal truth" and "personal practice." Wu Tsing-chao asserts in his book, "Sociological Essays,"

that the social character is "mysterious," "abstract," "beyond the grasp of the mind," that it can be comprehended only from the standpoint of a subjective experience.

Wu Tsing-chao declares that the cause of the destitution and the poverty of the Chinese people prior to the Liberation was to be found not in the semi-feudal, semi-colonial social system but, first and foremost, in the "lag of the cultural factor," "backwardness in resourcefulness," "lag in the development of science"; that the existence of these was the result of the fact that the "intellect and talents of the Chinese had not been applied to these matters" and that "very little of the beneficial things had been adopted from other civilized countries during the building of a cultural foundation in China." According to Wu Tsing-chao, in order to convert China into a mighty industrial power one needs only to develop science; to do this it is necessary ... first to reduce China to the former position of national enslavement (!) in order "to begin to take on civilization from other countries" (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957). Wu Tsing-chao also holds China's lag responsible for the overpopulation. He writes: "Overpopulation is the greatest enemy. Our country has a considerable population density... If China had only 30 million people, life would be considerably better and all problems would be much more easily solved" (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957). For a reduction of the population he proposed an "active ennoblement of the race of the people" (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957) with the help of an "increase in the birthrate of people from the higher strata of society and a reduction in the birthrate of people from the lower strata" (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957), that is, bourgeois eugenics. Wu Tsing-chao goes so far as to assert that a civil war would naturally and effectively do away with overpopulation. This neo-Malthusian theory of Wu Tsing-chao justifies the wars of imperialist occupation troops and Kuomintang bands against the Chinese people prior to the formation of the CPR, and calls in fact for a new intervention by the imperialists and for a counter-revolutionary uprising in China.

According to Wu Tsing-chao, a geographic factor had even been the cause for the country's poverty prior to the Liberation: shortage of land for agriculture and natural calamities. On the basis of this he contended that the problems of the scarcity of land and an effective struggle with natural calamities could allegedly be solved also without basic changes in China's social production relations, i.e., without the liquidation of feudal and usurious exploitation. Declaring that "the problems of life of the Chinese peasants could not be solved with the aid of the peasant movement..." (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957), he openly opposes the agrarian revolution and comes out for the immortalization of landlord aggression. Finally, Wu Tsing-chao finds the causes for the poverty and backwardness in old China to lie in psychic factors, in the fact that the Chinese suffer from "a lack of personal

persistence" and that "the Chinese workers have bad habits." The anti-popular character of this "concept" requires no commentary.

Pretending that his theory "surpasses all the other theories of the origin of the state," Wu Tsing-chao is only repeating what one has heard before from bourgeois sociology, which contends that the state came into being only for defense from foreign enemies, that it arose a considerable time prior to the existence of classes, and that it is therefore not a product of class antagonisms and a weapon for the suppression of one class by another. Showering praise on the bourgeois system, Wu Tsing-chao writes that "under contemporary conditions all the capitalist states, without exception and not depending on whether they are a one-party dictatorship or have a multi-party system, serve the interests of all or of the majority of people, as they themselves declare" (Kwangming Jihpao, 6 April 1957). Extolling bourgeois parliamentarianism and its characteristic competitiveness of parties, Wu Tsing-chao attempted -- as he himself later admitted -- to provoke a split of the united front in order to convert the democratic parties into an opposition to the Communist Party, to facilitate the overthrow of the people's rule and the revival of capitalism.

The most influential figure and chief champion among the right-wing scholars of the rehabilitation of bourgeois sociology was a disciple of the British bourgeois sociologist and defender of colonialism, B. Malinovsky, Prof. Fei Hsiao-t'ung -- assistant director of the Central Institute of National Minorities for the CPR. Fei Hsiao-t'ung had been educated in England and the USA. Following Malinovsky's method, he conducted "social research" in different regions of China and utilized the collected data for a eulogy of American-British imperialism and in defense of the interests of the Chinese landowners and usurers. Thus in 1948, when land reform was introduced in the liberated regions, Fei Hsiao-t'ung published a book, "Concerning the Reorganization of the Countryside," in which he stressed that it is necessary to retain landlord ownership which gave the landlord an opportunity to develop industry. After the formation of the CPR, Fei Hsiao-t'ung returned to China from the USA. Parting from his American colleagues, he told them frankly that he is going to the homeland not to assist the communists, but to propagate bourgeois liberalism in China. His activity in the CPR, particularly in 1956-57, showed that this bourgeois sociologist did indeed not spare his strength in the struggle against socialism.

In February of 1957, Fei Hsiao-t'ung published an article in the pages of the newspaper Wenhung Pao entitled "A Few Words about Sociology," in which he proposed to review all the basic problems of the regime of People's China. In a conference of Agitprop workers, convoked by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Fei

Hsiao-t'ung proposed to replace Marxist teaching about society with bourgeois sociology, demanded the legal restoration of bourgeois political doctrines, historiography, jurisprudence, and insisted on the transfer of the function of studying Chinese society and the preparation of cadres to bourgeois specialists. On 24 May 1957, Fei Hsiao-t'ung published an article in Jenmin Jihpao under the significant headline "Spring Has Arrived for the Intelligentsia." The contents of this article were subsequently included "in the scientific program" of the right-wingers which was published on 9 June 1957.

What did Fei Hsiao-t'ung offer the Chinese people? In his writings Fei Hsiao-t'ung developed the theory of moral control of the Chinese society." He asserted that the social order supports the morals, that "Chinese society" is a "moral society," and the only thing China needs is a proper "moral government." He even suggested the creation of a "society of a moral government," which would emerge from the Chinese people's tradition of self-restraint, which is promoting the preservation of a "barren system of economy" in the Chinese society, in which the people are supplied only with the meager gifts of nature and are not attempting to struggle actively with it.

In his opinion, the development of Western science and technology was furthered by a Christian world outlook and unlimited wants which stimulated man's struggle with nature; the development of science and technology necessarily leads to foreign expansion, and therefore resistance by backward people to the "scientific-technological advance" of Western capitalism is useless. To raise the economic level of the country, Fei Hsiao-t'ung and his confederates proposed to develop, not heavy industry, but agriculture in conjunction with home industry and small rural trading. Fei Hsiao-t'ung openly attacked the general line of the Communist Party.

In 1956, enjoying the privileges of a deputy of the All-China Assembly of People's Representatives, Fei Hsiao-t'ung conducted research in some rural regions of the country. Through material tendentiously gathered by him and his helpers he wrote a book in which he tried to put the achievements of socialist building in the countryside in doubt, and to discredit the agrarian policy of the Communist Party and the people's rule. Perverting facts, Fei Hsiao-t'ung attempted to show that the indivisible fund of the cooperative economy -- schools, creches, kindergartens, clubs, dispensaries, radio points, reading huts, and others more -- are not the property of the peasantry.

Fei Hsiao-t'ung counseled the peasants to obtain an improvement of their material situation not through the strengthening of cooperatives and the raising of labor activity, but through trading and other supplementary earnings. He also came out against government and cooperative administration of local and home industry, proposing to divide

it among the peasants. The "councils" of Fei Hsiao-t'ung are a program of kulak, capitalist development of the countryside.

Also in 1956, on a job for the national government, Fei Hsiao-t'ung headed a group to do research on the situation of national minorities in Yunan Province. Under the cover of "scientific research," Fei Hsiao-t'ung engaged in hunting up material discrediting party and government policy. Together with the exploiting leadership of the national minorities he defended the nationalist program, opposed the CPC national policy and the friendship of the peoples of China. He contended that the preservation of the unity of the socialist regime obviously makes a true equality of peoples impossible, that economic and cultural prosperity of the national minorities will not be achieved through a common struggle of all the peoples of China for the strengthening of the national-democratic system and the building of socialism, but through mutual alienation of the people. He leveled sharp criticisms at the communists and toilers of the Han (Chinese) people, supporting insolent attempts by some local bourgeois nationalists to exclude all the Han people from work in administrative, social, and party organizations of the national regions. Fei Hsiao-t'ung came up with provocative announcements to the effect that socialist content and national form of culture are mutually exclusive, and tried to preserve the old, or exploitative, content of national cultures.

After research in the situation of the nationality of the Tsingpo in Yunan Province, Fei Hsiao-t'ung put forward a provocative slogan: "First enlightenment, then enrichment," which was opposed to the policies of the Communist Party based on the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the development of agriculture forms the foundation for the raising of the cultural level and the well-being of the people.

The violent attacks by bourgeois philosophers and sociologists on dialectical and historical materialism met with a decisive rebuff from the entire advanced intelligentsia in the CPR. Bourgeois ideology, in particular the philosophical and sociological view of right-wing bourgeois scholars, was subjected to sharp criticism in the pages of the party press. With this aim extensive discussions in scientific and educational establishments were organized in which both well-known scholars and young people took part. Principal theoretical debates did not only decisively expose the reactionary essence of bourgeois views. They also served as an important school for the mastery of Marxist theory not only by young scholars, but also by representatives of the old intelligentsia who have had a bourgeois education, but who sincerely support the Communist Party.

The debates generated extensive interest in Marxist theory among the broad masses of Chinese toilers. Circles for the study of philosophy were formed in enterprises, establishments and educational

institutions, and in military units. Their audiences not only studied the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and of the prominent figures of the Chinese and international communist movement, but they also analyzed concrete conditions in enterprises, establishments, and others more, based on theoretical conditions, brought to light difficulties concerning work, and planned ways and means to overcome them.

The ideological-political growth of the theoretical cadres of the party was furthered by the timely exposure of the erroneous actions of a number of well-known scholars who according to their political leanings were not supporters of the right-wing bourgeois bloc. The views of these scholars, which had an objective-revisionist character, were close to bourgeois right-wing ideology and contemporary international revisionism. The revisionist views of the rector of Peiping University, Professor of Economy Ma Yin-chu, of professors Fen Yu-lan (History of Chinese Philosophy) and Ho Ling (History of Western Philosophy) of the same university, were exposed.

In January 1958, Prof. Ma Yin-chu published a book, My Economic Theory, Philosophical Thought and Political Position, which elicited serious criticism from the scientific community. In defense of his position Ma Yin-chu published a number of articles in Chinese newspapers. Ma Yin-chu's philosophical views are characterized by eclecticism. He asserts, for instance, that the thesis of the Chinese philosophers of the period during the rule of the Sung Dynasty, Chen Yi and Chu Hsi, that "Li (reason, ideal -- Ed.) precedes matter" in effect corresponds to the laws of dialectical materialism (Ma Yin-chu, My Economic Theory, Philosophical Thought and Political Position, Peiping, 1958, pp. 9 and 10). Ma Yin-chu forcefully propagandizes the theory of the "cyclical revolution," according to which things and phenomena develop in a closed circle in which "one link follows the other, and beginning and end are locked together" (Ma Yin-chu, My Economic Theory..., p. 88). He passes this condition off as a law of the dialectic, as though this is being spread not only in the economic sphere, but also in every sector of the material and spiritual life of the society. For this very reason the theory defended by him is anti-scientific and metaphysical. In contrast to the dialectical method, which tries to register the detailed relationship of phenomena, it only establishes a single-line, simple and direct connection between closely adjoining phenomena. According to this "theory," the relationship, for instance, between the production of food and the population is only a relationship between products and the stomachs of the consumers. Ma Yin-chu does not take into account the relationship either between products and their producers or, what is even more important, between people in the process of production. Ma Yin-chu's "method" pays attention only to external connections between different links and does not consider their internal and much more essential aspect. For instance, he sees

only an external connection between overpopulation, the misery and the cultural backwardness of colonialist countries, and draws the erroneous conclusion that the population growth in any social structure inevitably leads to the impoverishment and the reduction of accumulation, and that it impedes the development of industry, science and culture in the country. Making use of such methods, one cannot, for instance, explain why in People's China the upswing in economy and culture takes place together with the growth of the population.

Ma Yin-chu's "method" recalls the notorious theory of "rotation," which was widely disseminated back in rural China; later it was used by some Western bourgeois historians and sociologists in the form of the theory of "cyclic recurrence."

Despite the dialectic, Ma Yin-chu believes that balance is a basic thing in development, and that a violation of the balance is something temporary, transient, that the struggle of opposites is only a violation of the balance, which inevitably must be restored.

The population problem is considered differently by the Communist Party of China. Marxists start with the assumption that man is the most valuable capital of society. Liu Shao-chi said in his speech at the second session of the Eighth CPC Congress, in which he criticized some scholars who had asserted that a large population prevents the creation of an accumulation: "They see in man only a consumer and think that many people mean many consumers; and they do not see man in the first place as a producer, and so they do not consider that many people means it is possible to consume a great deal of products and to create great stores of stocks. It is quite obvious that their views go counter to Marxism-Leninism" (Second Session of the Eighth All-China Congress of the Communist Party of China, Moscow, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 46).

The scientific community of China recently seriously criticized and refuted the views of a specialist on the history of Chinese philosophy, Prof. Fen Yu-lan, which for many years stood on an idealist position. Though he repeatedly announced his readiness to adhere to the correct, progressive scientific-political position after the Liberation of China, old views were however again creeping into his speeches at discussions which took place in 1957 at Peiping University on problems of the history of Chinese philosophy, and also into some articles, views which were now being passed off by him as "genuine Marxism" and as "real dialectical materialism."

As an historian of Chinese philosophy, Fen Yu-lan came out quite correctly for the assimilation of the heritage of the ancient Chinese philosophers. Chinese scholars who are Marxists pay great attention

to the study of the best traditions of Chinese culture. But in spite of the fact that the party also calls for an approach to the culture and ideology of ancient China from scientific positions which strictly take into account the concrete historical condition and class essence of this or that idea and tradition of the past, Fen Yu-lan somehow finds in the philosophical systems of ancient times some "abstract or general aspect" which must and should be inherited in its entirety. Thus, in his words, if Kung-tzu paid great attention to the principle of "Jen" (humanism, love), and the bourgeois reformer T'an Ssu-t'ung also spoke at the end of the 19th century about "Jen," and People's China also propagandizes love toward the fatherland, toward the people, "Jen" has therefore a general abstract meaning which is peculiar to all times and to all classes -- it is an external, universal category. Such an "analysis" conceals the fact that the Confucian "Jen" was connected with the moral norms of a slaveholding or pre-feudal system during the period of the Western Chou, that T'an Ssu-t'ung introduced into the concept of "Jen" the new content of a then progressive bourgeois humanism -- it conceals the democratic idea of equality and brotherhood, and the fact that socialist humanism by no means simply succeeds the "general abstract meaning" of the humanism of the past, but has a specific class character. Making a muddle of things, Fen Yu-lan conceals class antagonisms in the development of ideologies, and tries to balance idealism with materialism. These aims serve the thesis advanced by him to the effect that "in the history of philosophy there have been neither purely idealistic nor purely materialistic views, just as there is no such thing in nature as a rigid square or a rigid circle" (Chehsueh Yenchiu, 1957, No 5, p. 76). In other words, if the ideologies of this or that scholar have peculiarly contradictory views and reasonings, then it is generally impossible to judge whether it belongs to one of the philosophic camps. Such an approach leads to an incorrect estimation of the thinkers of the past.

Fen Yu-lan complains that "China has in recent times disclaimed quite a few of the ancient Chinese philosophers, and has inherited quite little from them" (Chehsueh Yenchiu, 1957, No 6, p. 25). Meanwhile he tries to defend the "right" for joint existence of feudal ideology and proletarian ideology. Meanwhile, the Marxist-Leninist approach to the ideological inheritance emphasizes that with respect to its historic past, "it is impossible in this case to interpret everything uncritically and without proof. It is necessary to distinguish all the rot engendered by the ruling classes of feudal antiquity from the fine ancient national culture... But this esteem has to become apparent by allotting history a fitting place in science, by respecting the dialectical development of history, but not by exulting about the old and defaming the present, and not by admiring all sorts of feudal poisons" (Mao Tse-tung, Sel. Wks., Vol 3, pp. 271-272).

Profs. Ho Ling, Chen Hsiu-tsai and others, calling themselves "genuine Marxists," undertook to defend idealism against the "dogmatists" -- among whom they counted the Marxists -- in their speeches during discussions of the problems of the history of Chinese philosophy at Peiping University in 1957, and in articles published by them at that time. Ho Ling wrote, "I also think that idealism has positive aspects not only as regards the availability of materialism and the dialectic for idealist elements, but also in the sense that idealism in itself contains positive traits" (Collection of Materials on the Discussions of the History of Philosophy of China, Peiping, 1958, p. 198).

These vulgarized views met their deserved rebuff. Thus, Prof. Chou Chi-tsze, polemicizing with Ho Ling, pointed out that there actually can be a rational core in the views of the philosopher-idealists, but it is contained in these views only when they have a contradictory, inconsistent character, when they contain along with idealism also materialistic ideas which also form this rational core.

The deliberate searchings by some Chinese scholars for a rational core in idealism signify in fact an attempt to slur over the political importance of the struggle of two directions in philosophy, and protect idealism from party criticism. Closing ranks with the right-wingers, these scholars oppose party-mindedness [partiinost] in science, they oppose "interference" by government and party in a philosophy which, as it were, enjoys the right of extraterritoriality, and which must be protected against the "encroachment" of politics and the class struggle. China's ideological struggle reconfirms the truth that everything which opposes proletarian, communist party-mindedness in philosophy in fact aids reaction.

An important role in the struggle against idealist philosophy was played by the journals Chehsueh Yenchiu (Organ of the Institute of Philosophy of the Chinese Academy of Sciences) and Hsin Chienshe; by the newspapers Jenmin Jihpao, Kuangming Jihpao and by a number of theoretical organs of the Communist Party and scientific institutions; they systematically published critical articles in which the revisionists' "theorems" inimical to Marxism-Leninism were exposed. In the course of the ideological struggle with the bourgeois philosophers and revisionists, books and collected works were published, such as the collection of articles by Prof. Kuan-feng Concerning the Methodology of Revisionists in Discussions about the History of Chinese Philosophy, and the collection of articles To a Criticism of Ma Yin-chu's Book 'My Economic Theory, Philosophical Thought and Political Position, Materials on Criticism of the Intermediate Line, and others, which played an important role in the raising of the ideological-theoretical level of the toilers of the Chinese People's Republic.

The strenuous struggle on the ideological front continues in China. The Communist Party rallies the progressive intelligentsia to Marxist-Leninist positions; it organizes systematic criticism and the exposure of all bourgeois and revisionist views; it defends the only scientific world outlook: Marxism-Leninism.

5646

- E N D -